

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 10, 15, 17, and 21 are independent. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,609,170 to Lehwalder *et al.* (hereinafter "Lehwalder") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,597,702 to Caugherty. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner states that Lehwalder substantially teaches Applicant's claimed invention of a riser. Applicant respectfully disagrees. With respect to claim 1, Lehwalder does not teach or suggest at least the following elements:

an adaptive initialization module coupled to the riser codecs, the initialization module to configure the riser codecs when the riser is connected to a motherboard having a codec controller and a primary codec;

said initialization module to automatically select between a first multi-codec configuration and a second multi-codec configuration based on a codec support capability of the codec controller.

Lehwalder teaches a method and device for managing a group of electrical devices, such as codecs, in a computer system. The Examiner has indicated that Applicant's adaptive initialization module is equivalent to Lehwalder's signal control

circuit. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Lehwalder does not teach a signal control circuit on its riser. To the contrary, Lehwalder's signal control circuit is located on the Motherboard. Thus, unlike the present invention, Lehwalder's signal control circuit is part of the Motherboard, not the riser.

The Examiner also states, and Applicant respectfully agrees, that Lehwalder does not teach or suggest Applicant's element of "said initialization module to automatically select between a first multi-codec configuration and a second multi-codec configuration based on a codec support capability of the codec controller." The Examiner further states that Caugherty teaches selecting codecs based upon the support capability of the codec controller. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Unlike the present invention, the section of Caugherty cited by the Examiner teaches that a calling endpoint sends a notification to a called endpoint providing its codec capabilities for encoding and decoding signals. *Caugherty*, col. 2, line 62 – col. 3, line 4. The called endpoint then chooses one of the codec capabilities for encoding and one of the codec capabilities for decoding. *Id.* at col. 3, lines 5-16. Thus, unlike the present invention, wherein the initialization module on the riser "automatically select[s] between a first multi-codec configuration and a second multi-codec configuration based on a codec support capability of the codec controller, Caugherty allows the called endpoint to select the codecs for encoding and decoding based on the codecs supported by the called endpoint.

Thus, neither Lehwalder nor Caugherty, separately or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims

2-9) are patentable over Lehwalder and Caugherty. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom (2-9).

With respect to independent claim 10, the Examiner states that Lehwalder teaches Applicants' claimed invention of an adaptive initialization module. Applicant respectfully disagrees. With respect to claim 10, Lehwalder does not teach or suggest at least the following element:

said address controller to select a two-codec address structure when the signal status indicates that the codec controller supports up to two codecs and a three-codec address structure when the signal status indicates that the codec controller supports up to three codecs.

As previously indicated, contrary to the present invention, Lehwalder teaches managing the codecs based on whether an original primary device (*i.e.*, original primary codec), is enabled or disabled. *Lehwalder*, Abstract; col. 2, lines 38-50. If a presence indicator indicates an enabled codec on the motherboard, then that codec is the primary coded. *Id.* at col. 4, lines 61-64. If the presence indicator does not indicate that the codec on the motherboard is enabled, then one of the codecs on the riser is designated the primary codec. *Id.* at col. 4, lines 64-67.

Instead, the present invention teaches "select[ing] a two-codec address structure when the signal status indicates that the codec controller supports up to two codecs and a three-codec address structure when the signal status indicates that the codec controller supports up to three codecs." Thus, the selection in the present invention is based on what the codec controller supports and not on whether the original primary codec is enable or disabled (as taught in Lehwalder).

For at least the above reasons, independent claim 10, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 11-14) are patentable over Lehwalder. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 10, and the claims that depend therefrom (11-14).

Independent claims 15, 17, and 21 include similar elements as recited in independent claim 10. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 15, 17, and 21, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 16, 18-20, and 22, respectively), are patentable over Lehwalder. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 15, 17, and 21, and the claims that depend therefrom (16, 18-20, and 22, respectively).

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

s:/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/
Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(202) 986-3179

Dated: July 15, 2005

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: July 15, 2005

Signature

Rachael Brown
Rachael Brown

7/15/05
Date